DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 239 549 HE 016 973

TITLE	Soviet-Eastern European Research and Training Act of 1983. Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources. United States Senate, Ninety-Eighth Congress, First Session on S. 873.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources.
PUB DATE	27 Jul 83
NOTE	70p.; Not available in paper copy due to small print.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Area Studies; College Second Language Programs; Experiential Learning; Federal Aid; *Federal Legislation; Fellowships; Hearings; Higher Education; International Studies; *Research Projects; *Russian; Specialization; *Study Abroad
IDENTIFIERS	*Europe (East); *Soviet Research; Soviet Studies; USSR

ABSTRACT

Hearings on a bill to establish a Soviet and Eastern-European research training fund are presented. The Senate bill, the Soviet-East European Research and Training Act of 1983, identifies priorities in Soviet and East European studies and seeks to develop American resources and strength in these areas. It provides fellowships for training and research in the Soviet Union: first-hand experience of the Soviet Union, onsite conduct of advanced training, and access for American specialists to research institutions, archives, documents, personnel, and other research and training sources located in the Soviet Union. Russian language training is identified as an important prerequisite to these activities. Topics of consideration include: the U.S. government's role in supporting Russian and East European studies, the role of Title VI of the Higher Education Act, the management aspects of the proposed legislation, and the establishment of an endowment as a funding mechanism for the training fund. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE

S. Hrg. 98-377

SOVIET-EASTERN EUROPEAN RESEARCH AND TRAINING ACT OF 1983

ED239549

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON
EDUCATION, ARTS AND HUMANITIES

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON
LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES
UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

S. 873

TO HELP ENSURE THE NATION'S INDEPENDENT FACTUAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE SOVIET UNION AND EASTERN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES, TO HELP MAINTAIN THE NATIONAL CAPABILITY FOR ADVANCED RESEARCH AND TRAINING ON WHICH THAT KNOWLEDGE DEPENDS, AND TO PROVIDE PARTIAL FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR NATIONAL PROGRAMS TO SERVE BOTH PURPOSES

JULY 27, 1983

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

NIE016 973

Printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
24-826 O WASHINGTON : 1983

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah, *Chairman*

ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Vermont
DAN QUAYLE, Indiana
DON NICKLES, Oklahoma
GORDON J. HUMPHREY, New Hampshire
JEREMIAH DENTON, Alabama
LOWELL P. WEICKER, Jr., Connecticut
CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, Iowa
JOHN P. EAST, North Carolina
PAULA HAWKINS, Florida

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia
CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
THOMAS F. EAGLETON, Missouri
DONALD W. RIEGLE, Jr., Michigan
HOWARD M. METZENBAUM, Ohio
SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, Hawaii
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut

RONALD F. DOCKSAI, *Staff Director*
KATHRYN O'L. HIGGINS, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS AND HUMANITIES

ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Vermont, *Chairman*

ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah
DAN QUAYLE, Indiana
JEREMIAH DENTON, Alabama
LOWELL P. WEICKER, Jr., Connecticut
JOHN P. EAST, North Carolina

CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia
THOMAS F. EAGLETON, Missouri
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut

POLLY GAULT, *Professional Staff Member*
DAVID V. EVANS, *Minority Professional Staff Member*

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS

WEDNESDAY, JULY 27, 1983

	Page
Black, Cyril E., Center for International Studies, Princeton University, Princeton, N.J., prepared statement	20
Clodius, Robert L., Dr., president, National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, Washington, D.C.; Dr. John V. Lombardi, dean of international programs, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.; and Dr. Michael S. Pap, director, Institute for Soviet and Eastern European Studies, John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio	27
Prepared statement	30
Lombardi, John V., Dr., dean of international programs, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind., prepared statement	37
Pervushin, Nicholas V., Dr., director emeritus, the Russian School, Norwich University, Northfield, Vt., prepared statement	11
Quayle, Hon. Dan, a U.S. Senator from the State of Indiana, prepared statement	2
Ulam, Adam B., Dr., director, Russian Research Center, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; Dr. Nicholas V. Pervushin, director emeritus, the Russian School, Norwich University, Northfield, Vt.; and Dr. Cyril E. Black, Center for International Studies, Princeton University, Princeton, N.J	3

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL

Articles, publications, et cetera:	
Comments from participants in the 1982 summer in-service training program, John Carroll University, Institute for Soviet and East European Studies	59
Communications to:	
Stafford, Hon. Robert T., a U.S. Senator from the State of Vermont, from Adam B. Ulam, director, Harvard University Russian Research Center, July 25, 1983	6

SOVIET-EASTERN EUROPEAN RESEARCH AND TRAINING ACT OF 1983

WEDNESDAY, JULY 27, 1983

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS AND HUMANITIES
OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:37 p.m., in room SD-430, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator Dan Quayle presiding pro tempore.

Present: Senator Quayle.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR QUAYLE

Senator QUAYLE. The committee will come to order.

I apologize for being late. We had a vote, and I believe we will be free for a while.

First, let me thank Senator Stafford for allowing me to go ahead with the hearing on the topic of Soviet and Eastern-European area studies.

I believe the Soviet Union is undoubtedly America's chief rival in world affairs and is likely to remain our competitor for some time to come. I happen to be on the Armed Services Committee, and all of us are very sensitive to the problem that we have in trying to come to grips with an understanding of the Soviet Union from a military-strategic point of view, and perhaps more importantly and less understood, from an economic and a character point of view.

Today, the subcommittee has before it S. 873, a bill to establish a Soviet-Eastern European research training fund, introduced by my colleague, Senator Lugar.

I believe that these hearings will be quite beneficial as we try to get a handle on the issue. In the 1970's, we witnessed a steady and at times, a precipitous, sharp decline in the number of newly trained specialists, almost back to levels of 1965. In all American universities, only nine doctoral dissertations in Soviet foreign policy were defended in 1979, and this was the largest number during the preceding 5 years. In 1980, more college students studied Latin than Russian; more studied Norwegian than Polish. I believe a number of these statistics are quite revealing in our lack of attention. I am sure that our panel will point out the merits and demerits about particular legislation and suggestions that they may have, and also, be able to perhaps focus on and summarize the reasons for the importance of this type of an effort. We have been

debating on the floor of the Senate for the last 2½ weeks the Defense authorization bill, and much of the rhetoric and much of the debate was focused right at the Soviet Union; almost entirely, probably 99 percent of it, talked about military doctrine, talked about Soviet planners, talked about the strategic deterrents, first strike vulnerability, arms control—you name it—but there was hardly a breath of any interest in understanding of the people, of the culture. As a matter of fact, I do not even know offhand if we have any people in the Senate who consider themselves even quasi-experts in Russian history or Russian language. And yet, it dominates our discussions time and time again. So I think that this legislation, certainly, the intent of it and the thrust of it, is something that I strongly support.

I will tell our panels that each of their testimonies in full will be inserted in the record, if they want to summarize and highlight the points.

[The prepared statement of Senator Quayle follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR QUAYLE

I would like to welcome our panelists today, and to thank Senator Stafford for allowing me to go ahead with this hearing in his absence on the topic of Soviet and European area studies.

The Soviet Union is America's chief rival in world affairs, and is likely to remain our main competitor for some time to come. The Soviet Bloc competes for economic resources, political influence, and most importantly, the hearts and minds of people around the world—both those who are free and those who are not free. In my position as a member of the Armed Forces Committee, I am aware of the problems posed to American policy makers by the lack of information about this key region.

Today the Subcommittee has before it S. 873 a bill to establish a Soviet European Research and Training Fund, introduced by my colleague, the Senior Senator from Indiana, Mr. Lugar. I am pleased that I can help this important legislation come closer to reality with these hearings.

Proponents of this legislation believe that the United States is running low on a critical national resource: expertise on the Soviet Bloc. While the USSR has invested intensely in international studies, including closely targeted studies of the United States, we have done the exact opposite.

Private and public funding for foreign language and area studies, heavy in the 1960's, has dropped so low over the past decade that in the area of Soviet Bloc analysis we have fewer than two thirds of the specialists we need. The 1970's witnessed a steady, and at times sharp, decline in the number of newly trained specialists—almost back to the levels before 1965. In all American universities, only 9 doctoral dissertations in Soviet foreign policy were defended in 1979, and this was the largest number during the preceding five years. In 1980, more college students studied Latin than Russian; more studied Norwegian than Polish. According to a survey of 278 American university and research institutions conducted by the Rockefeller Foundation, dollar support for area studies was projected as declining in real terms by 28 percent from 1980 until 1982.

In contrast to American efforts, over the course of the last 25 years the Soviet Academy of Sciences has put in place a network of institutes designed to carry out comprehensive data collection and assessment essential to policy in international relations. There are over 7,400 specialists working in 12 Moscow institutes alone. Dozens of Soviet universities support work by specialists in "Americanistics." No single U.S. institution can match the nearly 100 employees of the Institute for the Study of the United States of America and Canada, or the more than 500 employees at the Soviet Institute of the World Economy and International Relations.

Clearly, U.S. efforts in the field of international and area studies have flagged, while our rivals have increased their study and surveillance of us. However, despite the apparent need for an increased American effort to understand the Soviet Bloc, I do have several concerns for the kind of effort we undertake, and how that effort is to be administered.

First, I am concerned that the establishment of an endowment is an approach with which the Congress is quite unfamiliar. The use of endowments is usually asso-

ciated with private foundations and nonprofit organizations. I hope that our hearings today can explore whether the use of this funding mechanism will set an unwanted precedent within the higher education community, and whether our panelists would favor this funding approach for other programs.

Second, I am concerned that this legislation names into law an academic organization as a recipient of program funds—an approach which, while not unique, is rarely used. Certain Ellender Award Fellowships and monies flowing through the Woodrow Wilson Center have similar authorized appropriations, however these are quasi-governmental entities. I would like to explore whether our panelists believe the naming of a few select groups will give rise to higher expectations in other groups, together with fears of greater governmental control.

Finally, I am concerned that the international education community will believe that this new program represents abandonment, either by design or accident, of International Education Programs under Title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965. To meet some of this concern, Senator Stafford and I are today requesting comment from the Department of Education on the future of Title VI, to be received by September 1, 1983.

Under Title VI, graduate and undergraduate area studies centers, foreign language training, and most recently, international business education programs at colleges and universities around the country are authorized for appropriations. These programs are designed to be "national resource centers" for the teaching of modern foreign languages, and for research and training in international studies. Total budget authority for these programs in fiscal year 1983 was $26 million; the Administration has requested elimination of these programs within the Department of Education in fiscal year 1984. Programs in the Defense and State Departments are expected to take their place. I would like to ask our panelists for their comments on Title VI of the Higher Education Act and its relation to the proposed legislation.

Senator QUAYLE. The first panel is Dr. Ulam, from the Harvard University Russian Research Center. And we have Dr. Pervushin, from The Russian School of Norwich University in Vermont; and Dr. Black from the Center for International Studies at Princeton.

Dr. Ulam, would you proceed, please?

STATEMENT OF DR. ADAM B. ULAM, DIRECTOR, RUSSIAN RESEARCH CENTER, HARVARD UNIVERSITY, CAMBRIDGE, MASS.; DR. NICHOLAS V. PERVUSHIN, DIRECTOR EMERITUS, THE RUSSIAN SCHOOL, NORWICH UNIVERSITY, NORTHFIELD, VT.; AND DR. CYRIL E. BLACK, CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, PRINCETON, N.J.

Dr. ULAM. Well, Mr. Chairman, having written many long books in my life, I think I will be very brief with my statement. It can be read in 3 minutes, and I can summarize it in less than 5 minutes.

I think this legislation is most beneficial and very much needed, for reasons which I have tried to spell out and to which you alluded: the drying up of funds coming from foundations, shifts to other interests, the general difficulty the universities have had with maintaining their programs. So I do think that this effort on the part of the Federal Government would be most beneficial and would stimulate, also, interest on the part of other bodies—private bodies, foundations, universities themselves—to expand their training in Soviet-Russian affairs.

One point I should stress is that what is mostly needed is a certain critical mass of knowledge about the Soviet Union, not only in this body in the Congress of the United States, but throughout the country. I think what is very much needed is not sort of ad hoc specialization, for example, in the Soviet arms program, but a wide background in Soviet economy, politics, history, and those are the aims which I think your bill would serve, by providing teaching

and training programs, an increasing number of people who are—I do not like the word, "experts"; an expert is somebody who can put something together. I do not think I could put together a policy; I think that the thing to do is to use the word, "student," students of Soviet and Russian affairs. And that in itself would have a most beneficial, even if indirect, influence on policymaking.

As to the actual provisions of the bill, I would just make a few remarks. I would be skeptical about having any official body spell out the "priorities" in Soviet studies. Again, I think our main effort, the priority, should be general knowledge of Soviet history, government and politics, and with that can come sort of subspecialization in some issues touching on policy. So I think that a general background is an important thing, knowledge of the language, history, and so on.

The second point would be the question of where the emphasis should lie. Here again, you alluded to the fact that there has been quite an inadequate amount of training of young people who could take over for people trained right up to World War II and in the fifties. There has been a natural attrition of those people and a consequent lack of specialists in many of our schools. Even our leading institutions have serious deficiencies when it comes to the teaching staff. In some disciplines like economics, expertise on the Soviet Union, knowledge of the Soviet Union is really quite inadequate. We do not have enough distinguished people to fill positions in the leading universities in this country. and it is a matter of great urgency to the scholarship program that younger people do get an opportunity to pursue advanced studies.

Now, I was asked specifically about the difference from title VI, programs authorized by title VI. I think it is a good thing that this program envisages at least 10 years' duration, and I think if fellowships are contemplated, I think if at all possible, it would be desirable to fund graduate, and to some extent, postgraduate fellowships, for longer than just 1 year. I think in various social disciplines in this country, the degree of technical sophistication in the discipline itself takes so much time that many promising, first rate people, are hesitant to spend 2 or 3 additional years in mastering the Soviet field and language as well. So I think it is desirable to have a longer period of training under this act.

As to the technicalities of the bill itself, I think that it points in the right direction. I think that the question as to who should administer the money is to my mind secondary, though still important to the great need for more money, and of course, given the interest on $50 million, to my mind, it is hardly adequate to the magnitude of the problem and to the immediate and longer run needs we have.

I do think, and I assume that at some point, the oversight committee would create some advisory bodies, which would run different programs, or perhaps, advise on various aspects of the disbursement and funding of various programs. I think that this is something which has to be thought through. We already have several bodies of this kind, but perhaps what is needed is some new approach to the problem, and whether the techniques, let us say, used by the National Endowment of Humanities and so on, would not be

applicable to it is something again which I would not know, but still, it is something to consider.

So all in all, I am very much in favor of this bill, and I do hope that you and your colleagues will succeed in passing it so that Soviet and Eastern European studies in this country receive this very badly needed shot in the arm, and symbolically of course, the action by the Congress would undoubtedly stimulate similar efforts.

Thank you.

Senator QUAYLE. Thank you very much, Dr. Ulam.

[The following was received for the record:]

HARVARD UNIVERSITY
RUSSIAN RESEARCH CENTER

ADAM B. ULAM, *Director*
MARSHALL I. GOLDMAN, *Associate Director*

ARCHIBALD CARY COOLIDGE HALL
1737 CAMBRIDGE STREET
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS 02138
(617) 495-4037

25 July 1983

The Hon. Robert T. Stafford
Committee on Labor and Human Resources
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Stafford:

To answer your questions as succinctly as possible: the present state of studies in the area under discussion cannot be deemed satisfactory or adequate to the enormous importance of the subject, both in itself and from the national interest point of view. The last fifteen years or so have witnessed a considerable depletion in the ranks of first-class scholars and teachers devoting themselves to the Soviet field. (Those on Eastern Europe have always been in short supply.) The natural attrition of those experts, trained for the most part in the years following World War II and through the 1950s, has not been compensated for by sufficient numbers of younger students and scholars choosing to specialize in the subject. The main reasons for this state of affairs are as follows:

1) Inadequate financing of the studies and research in the area. With much of foundation and private support drying up during the last eighteen years or so (though there have been some signs of reversal of the trend recently), many promising students find it well nigh impossible to finance the extra years of study required if they are to achieve an expertise in Soviet affairs and the language, as well as to meet their general professional requirements as economists, political scientists, etc.

2) Inflation and the mounting costs have made it difficult for most schools and academic departments to create new or preserve old tenured positions for scholars specializing in Russian-Soviet subjects. Such subjects, even if they do find their way into the curriculum, are then taught by "generalists," people who quite often have but superficial knowledge of the field.

3) There is as yet an inadequate recognition of the fact (though again on this count we are seeing signs of improvement), and this is as true of the academic, as of the business, media and government communities, that one cannot be an expert on international affairs, or any specific area of the world, without at least a modicum of knowledge about the USS and Communism, their history and culture.

Executive Committee: ABRAM BERGSON, JOSEPH S. BERLINER, HAROLD J. BERMAN, DONALD FANGER, MARSHALL I. GOLDMAN, LOREN GRAHAM, EDWARD L. KEENAN, HORACE G. LUNT, RICHARD PIPES, ADAM B. ULAM

I believe that the above provides an adequate if indirect answer to the second question posed in your letter. Any action by our national government which stresses the importance of the problem and offers concrete help towards its solution would have wide and beneficial reverberations not only among the academic community, but among the general public as well.

Concerning the proposed amendment to S.873 I am in general agreement with its provisions. I have some reservations concerning Item I, under clause B, Second 7. To repeat what I wrote to Senator Lugar concerning a similar provision in the original proposal on the subject, I do not believe that an official or semi-official agenda of national research priorities would be, whether from the public policy or academic points of view, the most effective way of furthering the goals of the Bill. By all means let various government agencies, whether directly or indirectly, continue to commission studies that are of immediate importance to their own work. But I feel strongly that quite often a historical or analytical inquiry seemingly not focused on a "hot" issue may eventually turn out to be more instructive both to the policy maker and the general public and throw even more light on the question than a plethora of narrow, centered and frequently repetitious treatments of the Soviets' policies in Latin America or on arms control. Our first priority must be the raising of the level of general knowledge about Soviet and East European policies and of their historico-political background and development.

Some provisions of S.873 appear to me to require expansion and elucidation. Thus the Oversight Committee and its staff would presumably need advice of special panels to decide which institutions and individuals ought to receive assistance in line with the purposes of the Act. Let me add as my personal conviction that while the majority of the members of such panels should be composed of recognized authorities in the relevant disciplines who specialize in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, they should also include experts from non-Soviet fields, as well as non-academic people conversant with things Russian.

There is the sad but undeniable fact that only a relatively small number of institutions in this country have the personnel, library and other resources enabling them to carry on extensive programs of teaching and research in the field. While the purpose of this legislation should be to expand the number of such places, it is also advisable to build upon the already existing strength and resources. Insofar as graduate or post-graduate programs are concerned, both of the above aims could be furthered by a nationwide competition for individual grants for advanced study. Their recipients then could apply to the institution which they feld would best meet their needs. And/or the Oversight Committee might decide to assist training programs in Soviet studies that are already in existence.

In addition to the programs described in Sec. 7, some other projects come to my mind as pertinent to the objectives of the proposed legislation. one would be to do in a more systematic way what is already being done in a piecemeal fashion: to have a number of fellowships for mid-career

officials of our government (and perhaps especially those not directly concerned with Soviet affairs) to enable them to spend a year at an appropriate institution where they could expand their knowledge of Soviet affairs. In view of this country's superior resources and facilities for Soviet studies it would also appear advisable to help our advanced research institutes to disseminate knowledge about the USSR abroad and to host foreign scholars on a larger scale than they have hitherto been able to afford.

These are my main reflections concerning your proposed legislation. Let me emphasize once more how much I support its objectives and general approach.

Yours sincerely,

Adam B. Ulam
Gurney Professor of History
and Political Science

Senator QUAYLE. Dr. Pervushin?

Dr. PERVUSHIN. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, distinguished colleagues, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to appear before you at this hearing to share my views on the proposed amendment to Senate bill 873, the Soviet-Eastern European Research and Training Act of 1983.

I have been a witness to the major turning points in Soviet history and United States-Soviet relations and have had first-hand experience with the importance of research and scholarship in this field.

I feel that in general the amendment successfully addresses some critical needs in the area of research and training in Soviet and East European studies. Such efforts are to be applauded, especially in light of the growing sentiment in Government, academia, and press circles that American national interests are no longer being adequately served by dwindling expertise in broad areas of factual knowledge and expert analysis of the Soviet Union.

It is my belief that the United States can only successfully conduct relations with the Soviet Union from a position of strength—economic, military, and strategic. Strategic strength implies a healthy and active community of highly trained scholars and area specialists, with the necessary resources and training to allow them to gather, organize, analyze, and disseminate knowledge about this key area of the world.

The sad deficiencies from which American efforts in Soviet and East European studies suffer are, first of all, quantitative—that is, there are comparatively few specialists in this area trained in the United States—and second, qualitative: The quality of the Soviet and East European studies suffers, in my view, from a very serious lack of adequate language training, which is the first and most basic prerequisite for all of the areas of research addressed by the current amendment.

Section 2, paragraph 1, states: "Factual knowledge, independently verified, about the Soviet Union and East European countries is of the utmost importance to the United States." This independ-

ent verification of information cannot, in my view, be assured without expert knowledge of the Russian language.

It is language training in Russian that is so vital to the success of the programs envisioned by the amendment, and as such, a striking omission in the proposal is a statement of the fundamental and indispensable role of language training—in Russian, in particular—in advanced Soviet Union and East European studies.

It has been reported in the press that there are more teachers of English in the Soviet Union than there are students of Russian in the United States. In 1968, there were 607 institutions in the United States teaching Russian, to 41,000 students, while in 1980, there were only 475 institutions providing instruction in Russian to only 24,000 students. At the graduate level, the decline is even more startling.

In the past decade, there has been an average of only six dissertations a year on Soviet foreign policy by American graduate students with a working knowledge of Russian. Alarmingly, too often, American students of international relations, political science, economics, law, and history who specialize in the study of the Soviet Union, and even students in the field of Soviet studies, receive undergraduate degrees without having acquired even a working knowledge of the Russian language, let alone any spoken fluency or the ability to make use of documents and original sources in Russian, both prerequisites for serious graduate study.

Colleges and universities' ability to attract students to Russian language study is seriously impaired by the lack of funds for both programs and scholarships. An active effort must be made at the beginning and advanced levels of Russian language training to accelerate study in order to bring this admittedly difficult language within reach of future specialists at an early stage in their training. This calls for a direct statement in this amendment of the need for such support, as well as provisions for direct assistance to Russian language programs already in existence at many American institutions and funds for the creation of new programs to help make the study of Russian as attractive and realistic as possible for undergraduate and graduate students.

Maybe insertion in this section 2, part 3 of the Lugar amendment could be Russian language training. Such task forces as the Modern Language Association-American Council of Learned Societies, MLA-ACLS, in 1980 have already recommended precisely this kind of funding. They have recommended "support for language and area studies" and "to restore separate funding for summer language institutes, fellowship funds for the summer should be made available to support specially designed institutes, including both language and teacher-training programs." Further, this MCA-ACLS task force recommended "Federal appropriations in addition to the current title VI funding for regular academic year programs and for major summer institute programs."

As I understand, title VI provides some help for studies in foreign countries, but there is no emphasis on the enhancement of studies of the U.S.S.R.'s language and problems. The proposed amendment is important because it aimed to close this gap. Its provisions have probably also the advantage not to be subject to yearly revisions in the U.S. budget. On the other hand, one should supple-

ment it with a provision about the evaluation of the program of this amendment, for instance, in 8 years after its adoption by the Congress.

I believe this program, for instance, in such schools as the Russian School at Norwich University, would be a good model of how Russian ought to be studied in this country. There, prominent professors and college instructors from the sizable Russian-American emigre community in this country have been coming together in the summer for 24 years to offer undergraduate and graduate students an intense academic and cultural experience *speaking only* in Russian. Students at Norwich represent 100 universities and colleges, 12 high schools, and come from 34 States and 6 foreign countries this year. They are students of business, international relations, international law, economics, sociology, Soviet history, Russian language, and literature who have come to improve their command of Russian language for use in their chosen fields of study.

With increased intensive Russian language study, we can expect to achieve a much higher yield of independently verifiable factual knowledge about the Soviet Union, which will help forge new and better ways to conduct United States-Soviet relations.

I would like to make my statement as brief as possible, but I am ready to answer your questions.

Senator QUAYLE. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Pervushin follows:]

TESTIMONY OF DR. NICHOLAS V. PERVUSHIN, DIRECTOR EMERITUS, THE RUSSIAN SCHOOL OF NORWICH UNIVERSITY, NORTHFIELD, VERMONT, BEFORE THE SENATE EDUCATION ARTS & HUMANITIES SUBCOMMITTEE, JULY 27, 1983 ...

Mr. Chairman, members of the Subcommittee, distinguished colleagues and guests, on behalf of the Russian School of Norwich University, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to appear before you at this hearing and share my views on the proposed amendment to Senate Bill #873, the Soviet-East European Research and Training Act of 1983. Before proceeding further, I would like to mention my background in relation to Soviet Studies and the issues addressed by the Amendment under discussion by your committee. I have been a witness to the major turning points in Soviet history and U.S. - Soviet relations and have had first-hand experience with the importance of research and scholarship in serving as the basis of factual information necessary to policy formation--particularly with respect to the Soviet Union.

I was born in the city of Kazan, in Russia, in 1899. I graduated from the University of Kazan, where I did post-graduate work and taught courses in economics. I wrote my doctoral thesis while working in Germany from 1923 to 1926. Following my decision not to return to the Soviet Union, out of opposition to the politics of mass terror and destruction being carried on there at the time, I wrote for European economic and trade journals and periodicals and gave public lectures on Soviet literature. I left Europe and came to the United States in 1946. I worked for 16 years as a translator and senior interpreter at the Secretariat of the United Nations, during which time I also taught Russian language, literature and history courses to diplomats and members of the Secretariat. I later taught these same subjects at universities in the United States and Canada. I was Secretary

and then Chairman of the New York City Chapter of the Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages, an organization of which I am perhaps one of the longest standing members. I helped found the International Society of Dostoyevsky Scholars and was also one of the founders of the Russian School of Norwich University in Northfield, Vermont, where I am now Professor and Director Emeritus. My activities in the teaching of Russian language, literature and history--in a word Russian culture--together with my experience in international policy form the basic views and comments which I would like to offer you now in regard to the amendment under discussion.

I feel that, in general, the amendment successfully addresses some critical needs in the area of research and training in Soviet and East European studies. Such efforts are to be applauded, especially in light of the growing sentiment in government, academia and press circles that American national interests are no longer being adequately served by dwindling expertise in broad areas of factual knowledge and expert analysis of the Soviet Union and East Europe. It is my belief that the U.S. can only succesfully conduct relations with the Soviet Union from a position of strength, both military and strategic. Strategic strength implies a healthy and active community of highly-trained scholars and area specialists, with the necessary resources and training to allow them to gather, organize, analyze, and disseminate knowledge about this key area of the world, around which so much American foreign and domestic policy is forged. The sad deficiencies from which American efforts in Soviet and East European studies suffer are first of all quantitative--that is, there are far too few specialists in this area trained in the U.S.--and secondly qualitative: the quality of Soviet and East European studies suffers, in my view, from a very serious lack of adequate language training,

which is the first and most basic prerequisite for all of the areas of research addressed by the current amendment.

Section (2) paragraph (1) states "factual knowledge, independently verified, about the Soviet Union and East European countries is of the utmost importance to the U.S." This independent verification of information cannot, in my view, be assured without expert knowledge of the Russian language. It is language training in Russian that is so vital to the success of the programs envisioned by the amendment, and as such, a striking omission in the proposal is a statement of the fundamental and indispensable role of language training--in Russian in particular--in advanced Soviet Union and East European Studies.

The bill identifies important priorities in Soviet and East European studies and seeks to develop American resources and strength in these areas. It supports, among other things, "first hand experience of the Soviet Union "onsite conduct of advanced training" "access for American Specialists to research institutes, archives, documents, personnel and other research and training sources located in the Soviet Union." It is, however, not enough to speak only in general terms of the necessity for fellowships for training and research in the Soviet Union, when the needs of such programs will invariably be drawing from a dwindling pool of American specialists with competence in the Russian language. Enlarging this pool and making the necessary language training available to the widest possible field of highly-trained Americans in various disciplines is a prerequisite to the success and further development of programs fostering Soviet Union and East European studies. The Russian language heads the list of indispensable research tools in this crucial area.

The unfortunate assumption which has prevailed for too long that one can study the Soviet Union without Russian language skills is a dangerous myth which has contributed to the current sad state of affairs in both Soviet studies and the study of Russian in this country. This awareness should be clearly stated as a fundamental principle of the current amendment.

It is general knowledge that there are more teachers of English in the Soviet Union than there are students of Russian in the United States. In 1968 there were 607 institutions in the US teaching Russian to 41,000 students, while in 1980 there were 475 institutions providing instruction in Russian to only 24,000 students. At the graduate level the decline is even more startling. Over the past decade there has been an average of only 6 dissertations a year on Soviet foreign policy by American graduate students with a working knowledge of Russian. Alarmingly too often, American students of international relations, political science, economics, law and history who specialize in the study of the Soviet Union, and even students in the field of Soviet studies receive undergraduate degrees without having acquired even a working knowledge of the Russian language, let alone any spoken fluency or the ability to make use of documents and original sources in Russian, both prerequisites for serious graduate study.

Increased support for Russian Language study must therefore be made available to American universities. The groundwork in acquiring a basic command of Russian must take place in the classroom under highly-trained supervision in order for any "on-site", full-time Russian experience to bear fruit, be it in an intensive immersion program like the one at Norwich University, or in the Soviet Union itself.

Colleges and universities' ability to attract students to Russian language study is seriously impaired by the lack of funds for both programs and scholarships. An active effort must be made at the beginning and advanced levels of Russian language training to accelerate study in order to bring this admittedly difficult language within reach of future specialists at an early stage in their training. This calls for a direct statement in this amendment of the need for such support, as well as provision for direct assistance to Russian language programs already in existence at many American institutions and funds for the creation of new programs to help make the study of Russian as attractive and realistic as possible for undergraduate and graduate students. Such task forces as the Modern Language Association - American Countil of Leafned Societies (MLA-ACLS) of 1980 have already recommended precisely this kind of funding: they have recommended "support for language and area studies" and "to restore separate funding for summer language institutes, fellowship funds for the summer should be made available to support specially-designated institutes, including both language and teacher-training programs". Further this MCA-ACLS Task Force recommended "federal appropriations in addition to the current title VI funding for regular academic year programs and for major summer institute programs."[1]

The successful mastery of any foreign language, however, in particular Russian -- owing to its complexity--can by far best be accomplished with reasonable commitments of time and resources in a so-called "immersion environment", that is, a full-time study and living experience in which the foreign language is used at all times, inside the classroom and out. Such

[1] Language Study for the 1980's, Reports of the MLA-ACLS Language Task Forces, ed. Richard D. Brod, NY 1980, MLA, p. 43.

an environment for the learning of Russian is to be found not only in the Soviet Union--far away and of limited access to the majority of students--but also right here in this country in language programs of the type offered by the Russian School of Norwich University. I believe this program is a good model of how Russian ought to be studied in this country. There, prominent professors and college instructors from the sizeable Russian-American emigré community in this country have been coming together in the summer for 24 years to offer undergraduate and graduate students an intense academic and cultural experience speaking only in Russian. Students at Norwich represent 100 universities, 12 high schools and come from 34 states and 6 foreign countries. They are students of business, international relations, international law, economics, sociology, Soviet history, Russian language and literature who have come to improve their command of Russian for use in their chosen fields of study. Similarly, graduate students in Soviet and East European policy studies come to Norwich to work on those language areas of particular importance to their work. Graduates of the Russian School of Norwich University and institutions like it go to work in Soviet legal affairs, for the State Department, the National Security Agency, Central Intelligence Agency and Defense Department. All of our students are highly aware of the fact that their work in the field has proved far more effective and sound as a result of their full command of the language and acquaintance with Russian culture. Alongside language study, students at Norwich have the unique opportunity to advance their knowledge and understanding of the Soviet Union through close contact with Russian-

American scholars, teachers and writers, who represent a first-hand resource of personal knowledge of the Soviet Union elsewhere unsurpassed.

Programs like the one at the Russian School of Norwich University represent a tested and vital resource in the assurance of Russian language expertise among American scholars and specialists in Soviet studies. Such programs are of fundamental importance in developing and disseminating the language competence necessary for all facets of increased efforts to promote high quality Soviet and East European studies. There should, therefore, be a clear statement of the value and need for such work in the amendment under discussion by your committee.

With increased intensive Russian language training, we can expect to achieve a much higher yield of independently verifiable factual knowledge about the Soviet Union which will help forge new and better ways to conduct US-Soviet relations. Without this clear perception and without active support of the most fundamental aspect of Soviet and East European studies--that is, the study of the Russian language as its primary and indispensible tool of research--the timely and vital programs outlined in the "Soviet-Eastern European Research and Training Act" will not be best served. These programs will only bear their full fruit in the hands of highly-trained American specialists from all areas whose training includes the Russian language.

Senator QUAYLE. Dr. Black?

Dr. BLACK. Thank you, Senator Quayle.

I was asked three questions in the letter inviting me to testify here. I would like to spend most of my time on the third question.

The first had to do with the need for support of Russian studies. You have already cited some examples of the decline in recent years, and much has been said about this in earlier testimony, so I will not go into that any further.

The second question concerned the role of the Federal Government, for the Federal Government has been supporting Russian and East European and other foreign area studies over the years, and it seems to me it is an appropriate role for the Federal Government to continue in this line.

One specific question was asked, namely; the role of title VII of the Higher Education Act, title VI. The difference there is that title VI supports universities directly, teaching programs of various sorts, and some administration and fellowships. There is some overlap in graduate fellowships between title VI and the present bill and that should be taken into account by the body administering it. But this would not be a reason for changing title VI. It is simply a minor matter which can be considered in the administration of the new bill.

The third point which I wish to stress more is the administration of the funds which are proposed here. It seems to me that the Senate version is a great advantage and improvement over the earlier version of the bill. I think it is important that the administration of the fund be kept separate from the users of the funds, for all the obvious reasons. In the administration of the proposed funds, it will be important to maintain a distinction between policy-related studies which bear closely on issues of contemporary concern, and the longer term problems with history, politics, economics, and so on. Policymakers will press for the former, and scholars will press for the latter. Both are essential to the enterprise at hand, and the oversight committee will have to tread a fine line between these two themes in guiding research, both into practical channels of interest to the government and to the public, and in the longer term, academic channels, which are more important in certain respects, but do not have the immediate results.

In making arrangements for the administration of these funds, I think the oversight committee should work in particular and take advantage of institutions already established, national institutions already established in this field. I am thinking of two in particular. One is the International Research and Exchanges Board, known as IREX. That is the national institution drawing on the entire country for providing access to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, both for younger scholars, graduate students, and for senior scholars. It has worked very successfully. It needs better funding, and it is certainly the best institution to handle that aspect of the entire project.

The second that comes to mind is the Kennan Institute of the Wilson Center in Washington. Its particular experience lies in providing access to the great facilities of Washington, the Library of Congress and the many governmental research institutions, and also organizing conferences at a national level, and for providing

for public dissemination of scholarly knowledge through the Radio Smithsonian and TV programs and other forums. The Kennan Institute has been doing this for a number of years, and the country would benefit greatly if its facilities were used.

Beyond that, it seems to me that we should recognize that American appraisals of the Soviet Union and the Communist countries of Eastern Europe have tended to fluctuate between admiration and antipathy over the years. These are emotional approaches, which are not a sound basis for policy. They need to be replaced by a greater understanding, an understanding that will lead us toward reasonable solutions to problems that could engulf us in an immense catastrophe. The Soviet-East European Research and Training Act of 1983 is an important step toward such an understanding.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Black follows:]

Testimony before the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, U.S. Senate, July 27, 1983

Cyril E. Black, James S. McDonnell Distinguished University Professor of History and International Affairs.

It is a matter of great concern, at a time when relations with the countries of the Soviet orbit play such a large role in our foreign policy, that American study of these countries is in a period of serious decline.

In the 1950s and 1960s we trained a large number of specialists in Soviet and East European studies, and the United States became the leading national resource for research and training in these fields. During the past ten or fifteen years, academic work in these fields has not been maintained. There is a danger that the scholars of this early generation will not be replaced by a new generation with equal training. The preparation of young scholars in such critical specialties for the understanding of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe as languages, economics, sociology, and foreign policy, are particularly deficient. There are also important regions, such as the Caucasus and Central Asia, in which our knowledge of peoples and societies in the process of rapid change is very limited. One critical indicator of this decline is that applications for study in the U.S.S.R. have been reduced by over a third in recent years, and this reduction is particularly acute in the social sciences.

Financial support for research and training in these areas has declined significantly in recent years, and it is a matter of national interest that this trend be reversed. In the countries of Western Europe the governments play a leading role in promoting the study of critical foreign areas, and the proposed "Soviet-Eastern European Research and Training Act of 1983" now before the two Houses of Congress represents an appropriate response on the part of our government to this challenge.

The federal government has for many years supported a wide range of area and language programs at leading universities under Title VI of the Higher Education Act. Title VI differs from the legislation presently under consideration in a variety of ways. It is concerned with all foreign areas, and only a limited share of the funds are for Soviet and East European studies; and these funds are used for diverse administrative, teaching and research needs including graduate fellowships. To the extent that the new legislation would also provide funding for graduate fellowships, this should be taken into account in administering the new funds.

Several important needs would be met by the proposal under consideration. Most fundamental is fellowship support for graduate training leading to the Ph.D. in the appropriate disciplines. The long term purpose of the advancement of knowledge is best served by persons with a thorough grounding in one discipline and in the relevant language or languages. Without thoroughly trained scholars, nothing can be achieved. They represent the essential foundation for gaining an imaginative understanding

of Soviet and East European affairs and also for carrying out the broader purposes of this proposal.

Adequate training at the Ph.D. level should include residence and study in the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe, and for this purpose appropriate exchange programs are essential. We would not respect research on the United States in other countries by individuals who had not spent some time in this country, and we would not value the work of our own scholars if they did not have personal familiarity with the lands and peoples of their specialty. Exchange programs are by definition reciprocal in character, and we should be prepared to continue admitting scholars from the Soviet Union and the East European countries despite the problems that this presents.

Once the number of trained scholars reaches an appropriate level, the other important purposes of the proposal before the Congress can be more easily achieved. Support for post-doctoral research, with appropriate access to libraries and to foreign travel, will serve to maintain the skills of our scholars and to increase our understanding of the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe.

At the same time, the training of scholars is only the foundation of a new effort to promote an understanding of the Soviet orbit. What is needed beyond this is a major effort to convey this understanding to the rest of the academic community, to the business community, and to the public generally. This can be accomplished by conferences, by lecture series, and by TV programs.

The proposed administration of the Soviet-Eastern Europe Research and Training Act of 1983 under an Oversight Committee represents a

significant improvement over earlier versions of the bill that have come to my attention. It is most important that the administration of these funds be kept separate from the institutions and individuals who will use them.

In the administration of the proposed funds, it will be important to maintain a distinction between policy-related studies which bear closely on issues of contemporary concern to the government and the public, and the longer-term problems of history, politics, economics, society, and culture that underlie current problems. Policy-makers will press for the former and scholars for the latter. Both are essential to the enterprise at hand, however, and the Oversight Committee will have to tread a fine line between those themes deemed important for guiding research into practical channels and those that are proposed by scholars working independently. Other federal institutions administering funds for comparable purposes, such as the National Science Foundation and the National Endowment for the Humanities, have established successful systems for providing peer-group review in a context of institutional guidelines. These precedents will be useful guides for the new enterprise.

In making arrangements for the administration of these funds, the Oversight Committee should to the extent possible take advantage of the experience of already established national institutions with a long and effective track record in this field. I am thinking in particular of the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX), which is the established body for facilitating access to the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe; and the Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian

Studies at the Wilson Center, which has had unusual success in several functions: administering a national program of research fellowships; facilitating the access of scholars in this country and abroad to the vast resources on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe that exist in Washington, especially those of the Library of Congress; organizing research conferences on many aspects of Soviet and East European studies; and also making provison for the public dissemination of research.

American appraisals of the Soviet Union and the Communist countries of Eastern Europe have tended to fluctuate between admiration and antipathy. These emotional approaches do not form a sound basis for policy. They need to be replaced by a greater degree of understanding--an understanding that will lead us toward reasonable solutions to problems that could engulf us in an immense catastrophe. The Soviet-East European Research and Training Act of 1983 is an important step toward such an understanding.

Senator QUAYLE. Thank you very much, Dr. Black.

I would like to ask the panel a couple of general questions. I think we have all agreed in various ways as to the need for this kind of assistance, and that the Federal Government needs to get more involved. I wonder if you might explain why there seems to be a lack of appreciation or lack of attention to Soviet studies and Eastern European studies and culture. Does that go back historically, or is it changing? Why do we have this basic problem? Is there any one overriding reason, or is it just a fact that is there?

Dr. Black, do you want to try first?

Dr. BLACK. I taught a course in Russian history for many years, and the involvement in it fluctuated, depending on the intensity of our relations with the Soviet Union. If Stalin did something aggressive, it would go up the following year; if things were quiet, it would go down.

I think one reason for the gradual decline has been that there, was a very rapid expansion after the Second World War, for obvious reasons, and then the number of jobs available, and the opportunities for employing this knowledge, did not at that time match the number of people who were graduating. So over the years, there was some decline. This was due also, I think, to the poor relations in the last 8 or 10 years with the Soviet Union. There did not seem to be an incentive for studying Russian, whereas in these times, we need more people. actually. So, if we gage the enthusiasm on the basis of public sentiment, you would get a very poor result. What one should do, as one has done with outer space and nuclear fusion and other great projects, is to recognize the problem

and work on it steadily year after year, regardless of public enthusiasm. And it seems to me that this bill will provide that steady basis for such a development, which we need.

Senator QUAYLE. Dr. Ulam, did you have a comment on that?

Dr. ULAM. Yes; I would endorse what Dr. Black said. One reason also has been that, as I said in my statement, people specializing in advanced studies find that the disciplines are becoming more and more technical, absorb more and more time, so let us say, the difference with economics, the difference between a generalist, as well as being a generalist and a specialist in Russian studies, is very likeiy to be a difference of 2 or 3 years of extra graduate work, which of course, with the present high cost of higher education, makes many first-rate people hesitate, about specializing in Soviet studies, or for that matter, even Far Eastern or Near Eastern studies, and I think that is why increased funding is of crucial importance in replenishing the corps of specialists in the field.

I think the same thing holds—I think Dr. Black pointed out that the intensity of interest varies according to the international situation whether in a crisis situation or at the opposite end, detente would bring more interest. But our main effort must be to try to create a critical mass of knowledge about the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, and of course, the situation in East European studies is even worse from the point of view of knowledge than vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. We need a critical mass, both in the country at-large and among the higher institutions of learning, something which is really adequate to the dimensions of the problem.

Senator QUAYLE. Thank you.

Dr. Pervushin?

Dr. PERVUSHIN. I agree with both of my colleagues completely. I would cite only one example of the rush to learn the Russian language after the first Sputnik. I remember this event increased enormously the number of students in the Russian field.

Now, I would like to stress also that the lack of sufficient number of specialists is closely connected with the graduate studies of Russian culture, Russian history, Russian language. For instance, there are insufficient funds for financial assistance for the graduate students. I would urge that these funds be increased out of the new financial means which will be provided by this bill.

Senator QUAYLE. Thank you.

I wonder if you might be able to specify a little bit further, say, the last two decades—well, let us go back to 1968 through 1983. Has there been a definite decline in participation in Soviet studies, language, training, and do you relate this toward the international relations field, as you have suggested? Is that the predicament, and do you see the trend declining more if, in fact, we do not somehow—I forget who it was that said it needs a shot in the arm to have some interest in this. Are the trendlines in this area of study going down, and will they continue to go down, in your opinion?

Dr. BLACK. There are various statistics on this. One is the number of people studying languages—and I do not have them all in my mind at the moment. Another is people taking courses, or Ph.D. degrees being given. But the best, I think, is applications for IREX, applications to go into the Soviet Union of predoctoral students. These students go after they take the general examination;

then, they go to the Soviet Union for 1 year to do research on the dissertation. All students in the field should apply and do apply, I think, in all disciplines. Now that number has been, I think, reduced by half gradually over the years. It used to be very competitive, and now they have a hard time scaring up applicants to get a good competition. I could put these statistics in my revised written testimony when the time comes.

I think that indicator, the decline in applications to go to the Soviet union for research in the various disciplines—these are not the science disciplines; they are handled separately, but the social science disciplines and literature—would be the best single figure which would answer your question and demonstrate this steady decline.

Senator QUAYLE. But do you see this steady decline continuing?

Dr. BLACK. Yes, if we did not have a shot in the arm, not that it would go down to zero, necessarily, but it would at best continue at a rather low level.

Senator QUAYLE. Does anybody else want to comment on that? Dr. Pervushin?

Dr. PERVUSHIN. I would like to give some numbers. For instance, the number of faculty positions in the United States and in Canada in the field of Russian language and this kind of study declined from 1980 to 1982 from 1,117 to 1,047. So that is the tendency which can be proved by the statistics. These are statistics from the Russian Language Journal, which are very solid, very good. That, I think, also can be proven by other statistics about the enrollment in the Russian language classes. There are some exceptions. Our Norwich University Russian Summer School is not suffering from this decline, but other institutions are suffering even now.

Senator QUAYLE. Dr. Ulam?

Dr. ULAM. I think there has been inadequate recognition of what you yourself said, namely that one cannot really be a specialist in international affairs or any sort of subspecialization like, let us say, arms control, without having some, at least modicum, of knowledge about Soviet affairs and communism. I think this tendency to tie various programs too closely to policy-related questions does harm, even from the policy study point of view. I think the great need, really, is to build a broad basis of knowledge of the Soviet Union, and I think that anybody, whether dealing with Africa, Latin America, arms control, or international trade, should have as a strong subspecialization, some knowledge of Russian history and politics, and also very desirably, the language.

Senator QUAYLE. Unfortunately, I have another vote on the floor. I want to thank this panel very much for your testimony. I am sure that I and Senator Stafford will want to communicate further with you and others who are interested in this.

May I advise the second panel, I will be gone about 15 minutes, but go ahead and take your seats, and we will resume with the second panel promptly after my return.

I thank the panel very much.

[Short recess.]

Senator QUAYLE. The committee will come to order.

I apologize for being later than I thought, but we had two votes instead of one, and we may get another one in about 15 or 20 minutes, so with that, let us proceed.

First on my list is the National Association of State Universities, Dr. Clodius.

STATEMENT OF DR. ROBERT L. CLODIUS, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES AND LAND GRANT COLLEGES, WASHINGTON, D.C.; DR. JOHN V. LOMBARDI, DEAN OF INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS, INDIANA UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON, IND.; AND DR. MICHAEL S. PAP, DIRECTOR, INSTITUTE FOR SOVIET AND EASTERN EUROPEAN STUDIES, JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY, CLEVELAND, OHIO

Dr. CLODIUS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and to testify in support of this legislation on behalf of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. Our association, which is the oldest higher education association in the United States, represents 142 principal State universities and land grant colleges in the 50 States and territories. They enroll more than 3.7 million students, and grant 38 percent of all higher education degrees, including 64 percent of all doctoral degrees.

I am the president of this association, and I speak also as a past vice president for Academic Affairs of the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and past executive vice president of the University of Wisconsin system. All of this was between 1962 and 1971, when universities made their giant strides in area and language programs, and the University of Wisconsin was very active in this process.

There were three questions in Senator Stafford's letter, and I would like to respond to them. The first question was: What is your assessment of the current academic efforts? My response is, it is inadequate on the supply side. Here is where supply side has real meaning to an economist, and it is totally inadequate.

I have also tried to speculate a little bit as to why this is so, and I think one of the reasons is the failure of the International Education Act, which was enacted in the 1960's, to be fully funded. Of course, the second thing is the ups and downs of Federal support, as represented in title VI, and with the instability in funding, of course, there is instability in terms of inducing students to enter a field.

The second question was: Should there be increased Federal effort? I think the answer here is clearly yes. I should also comment that most State legislatures view something like Russian and Soviet and East European studies as a Federal problem, although some States do have a special interest in some fields. Early in the history of the University of Wisconsin, they offered programs in Polish studies, and if you had as many Poles in South Milwaukee and in Stevens Point as Wisconsin has, the university would also offer Polish and East European studies. There were some unfortunate consequences of this, however, to the effect that we said jokingly that our students learned Russian with a Polish accent.

The third question was: Will S. 873 meet some of the needs you see exist in the area? I think the answer here is clearly yes.

Now, there are certain essential elements in the bill that foster the development of such studies, and I would like to note them. One is stable and assured funding. The second thing is implied in the bill, and I would like to see it made explicit in some way, that the field needs something in research and scholarship beyond the present funding that exists in title VI, and this study gives that promise.

The third thing is the recognition that the Soviet Union is not going to disappear in 1 year, 2 years, 5 years, 10 years, 20 years, or whatever, and we need to have a long-term commitment on the part of this Nation to study the Soviet Union as long as it is around.

Now I would like to fill out the rest of my time by making some personal observations and telling a few anecdotes. When I was in graduate school, I had a friend who decided to enter the field of Soviet studies, and so he spent a good deal of time studying Russian, area studies, and got to be a Soviet specialist, and was a member of the staff of the Russian Research Center at Harvard in the mid-1950's. But then, he saw that if he were going to have a full comprehension of the meaning of Soviet economics, he would also have to study it through Chinese eyes, so he took 2 years out of his life to become competent in Chinese. Well, the point of this is that with the requirement for such a long period of personal commitment and involvement to induce people to enter this period of long study, stable future prospects for support are required and a sense that the Congress and this nation believe that the study is important.

As I think about this bill now, I think also in terms of the necessity for people interested in Soviet studies to also begin learning Spanish, because it is obvious to my untrained eye that Spanish and Russian make the same kind of combination of interest to be inquired into by scholars that formerly existed in Chinese and Russian.

Another anecdote. A friend of mine at the university read in the local paper one morning that Pravda had announced that he was an American spy and that he would be arrested if he ever showed up in the Soviet Union again. As far as we could figure out, his only crime was that he had written a critical essay.

But the rhetorical question here is, who wishes to subject himself and his professional future to such whim and such caprice. I think only the promise of some kind of long-term support would induce a scholar to do that. In 1968, I went to the Soviet Union as an economist with a team of university people to see why our exchange scholars were being refused in certain areas. We learned that Soviet authorities did not want economists poking around and studying the Soviet system. We also learned that they did not want our historians studying the period of Russian imperialism in the other Soviet republics. So, the conclusion that you reach is that if you want to support scholars investigating this field, if we cannot get them into the field experience, then they have to be supported here at home.

I would be pleased to respond to any questions that you may have.

Senator QUAYLE. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Clodius follows:]

Statement of Dr. Robert L. C odius

President of

The National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges

before the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources on July 27

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and your colleagues today and testify for this important legislation on behalf of National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. Our association, which is the oldest higher education association in the U.S., represents 142 principal state universities and land-grant colleges in the 50 states and the territories, which enroll more than 3.7 million students, and grant 38 percent of all higher education degrees (in the nation), including 64 percent of all doctoral degrees.

I speak on behalf of this constituency in support of S. 873, at a time when funding and support for scholars in the Soviet and East European studies is at a low ebb, and when the need for global understanding for peace and our national security has never been more evident.

The intent of this legislation is to fund those three institutions which are well-established and which offer the most credible track records for this endeavor. They are: The National Council for Soviet and East European Research, The International Research and Exchange Board and the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. These institutions can address the areas in which deficiencies now exist and address the overview of research in this area. We conclude that these are appropriate institutions for support and note that they now pass through funds to a large number of universities and colleges to support academic programs.

For others on this panel you have heard a more precise state of the current needs of this nation for increased number of Soviet experts. I can only echo some of the litany of statistics:

- Funding for Soviet and East European studies dropped by almost 70 percent between 1965 and 1980. In constant dollars, academic programs on our campuses are now trying to survive on less than one-fourth of their 1965 funds. Government funding for research in these area studies decreased by 50 percent between 1967 and 1976 alone. Funding from almost every source has been reduced--all this at a time when the Soviet Union is reported to be engaged in a major effort to improve its international studies capacity.
- The number of U.S. college students studying the Russian language is sharply declining. Between 1972 and 1980, U.S. college enrollments in Russian language courses declined by one third. In secondary schools, enrollments dropped by over 70 percent in the 1970s. And, the Modern Language Association reports that in 1980, more American college students studied Latin (25,035) than Russian (23,987).
- According to a recent assessment studies by the National Council on Foreign Languages and International Studies, less than two-thirds the number of Soviet and Eastern European experts needed are presently working in the field in government, academic and private sectors. Moreover, the education pipeline is drying up. In addition to a sharp decline in the number of newly-trained specialists entering the field, our institutions are now predicting a sharp increase in the number of faculty retirements in all fields, beginning in the 1990s.

The facts are persuasive--there is genuine cause for alarm to believe that now is the time to reverse the situation. One must realize that for a student to enter this field, that person must choose to continue his studies for an additional three to five years, just to begin his language and area expertise. Those with an opportunity to study in Russia or in a specific East European country have a decided advantage in language training and cultural understanding. Advanced scholars need on-site opportunities for research, always difficult in a closed society, and in conditions which must call for a real personal committment. All of these personal demands and decisions must be made today in a climate that in itself does not encourage the best and the brightest, that is: the uncertainty of availability of funding for scholarships, of whether faculty and institutional committment can continue, of continued support for research libraries, of travel and exchange funds, of the continuance of ethnic languages in the USSR. We must reinforce our graduate

training and advanced research opportunities. We must recognize the financial crisis now facing most universities in the U.S., and to add to this, the special problems of the state university, where state legislatures are reluctant to take on issues such as foreign affairs and language training which are perceived to be national needs and national responsibilities.

The primary problem then is one of stable and assured funding. Annual appropriations, as we all know, have their ups and downs--and during these years, there have been more downs. Funding from all sources has been declining sharply, and only recently, partly as notice of this bill has sparked debate, has the private sector begun to take interest. For these reasons, there is great appeal in the federal endowment approach--a federal response to a federal concern. I would urge this committee to endorse this approach.

My second concern would be to differentiate these programs and the foreign language and area studies programs funded under Title VI, and urge the committee to include appropriate language to assure that this bill would in no way weaken the current Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs. This bill S. 873 is intended to supplement and build on these current programs, which offer support for basic understanding of all areas of the world. In fact, the one short coming of this legislation is that it centers on only the Soviet and East European region when in fact, as a nation we need to increase our understanding and expertise in a wider, global scope.

The Title VI program, authorized under the Higher Education Act as amended in 1980, is funded in 1983 at $21 million. A relatively modest program, it represents the core support for all foriegn language and area studies programs now at U.S. colleges and universities. At present, it funds about 90 National Resource Centers in 11 regional area studies, at some 44 universities--all at an average cost of less than $120,000 per grant, each year. These federal

funds--the important seed dollars to these centers--are matched about 10 to one by the receiving institutions. In addition, Title VI will fund about 700 fellowships to the graduate students who continue their studies at these centers--it funds about 50 awards from 40 to 80 thousand dollars for undergraduate studies--just over one million for a research program to develop teaching materials in less commonly taught languages. And it's newest component--to be funded this year for the first time--is a one million dollar matching grant program to encourage the internationalization of business programs on our campuses.

This modest program--about $21 million in all--has been very effective in promoting language and area studies--in the beginning and master's levels. It does not address itself to the type of high level expertise and specialities that are needed in this area for our national security needs--but offers a solid base of support to 13 Soviet Centers--which would indeed feed into the advanced research opportunities of this bill.

Again, I urge support for this bill and I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you and welcome questions.

Senator QUAYLE. Next, from that great university in Bloomington, Ind., Dr. Lombardi.

Dr. LOMBARDI. Just so you are sure we do not concentrate entirely on the "Little 500," I too would like to say a few words about this bill.

I am here testifying on behalf of the Association of American Universities, whose members include 50 major universities which share a commitment to research and graduate education as central elements of a university's purpose. The president of the Association of American Universities, Bob Rosenzweig, had expected to testify here, but he is out of the country, and so I have attached his testimony to mine, for the information of whomever is interested.

I come before you to talk about this legislation not as any kind of specialist in Soviet affairs or East European research, but as a university administrator with quite a bit of experience in the management of international studies. And from our point of view at Indiana, the Senate bill 873 addresses, in a creative and imaginative way, a significant weakness in our country's capacity to develop, maintain and improve our ability to analyze and understand the people, the economy, the government and the society of the Soviet Union and its allies in Eastern Europe.

So, let me just take a few minutes here to address three items that are related to this legislation: the need, the design, and the management.

Now, in the case of the need, you have heard already today quite a bit about it, and in summary, all I really want to say is that any thorough review of what our Nation's capabilities are in Soviet-East European analysis makes clear that we have suffered a serious decline in the number of highly qualified experts available—and I know that you have lots of statistical and other information to support this point, so I will not belabor it at any length.

Now, the design of this legislation for research and training for the Soviet and East European area has in it an element that is particularly important, and that is, its emphasis on the long-term nature of the problem. It takes something on the order of 10 years to create a scholar who has not only the technical and language skills that are required, but also the analytical experience that is necessary to make a major contribution to the Nation's needs. And the research that makes possible informed, accurate and successful international decisions by those who are involved in implementing national policy toward the Soviet Union and its allies requires a constant and substantial effort over an extended period. So any design to promote or develop that research has to have as its goal stable and focused support for at least a decade.

The current bill, of course, addresses this requirement through the use of an endowment. And while the income from such an endowment is obviously subject to the vagaries of interest rates and other economic factors, it does provide a firm base of financial support that allows the initiation and completion of long-term projects, such as the training of highly qualified professionals.

The endowment mechanism, because it insures stability of funding, allows us to carry out in addition multiyear research programs as well.

This legislation is not the only effort of the Federal Government in the area of international studies that focuses on the Soviet bloc. But programs of State and Defense Departments or the USIA, for example, focus on immediate concerns of those agencies involved. They tend to be short term in nature, and they are not designed to produce or to maintain expertise, but rather, to use expertise that is already available. These agencies, then, are really consumers of skills that will be developed under the auspices of the legislation that is proposed here.

The Department of Education, under title VI, sponsors an important program, as you have heard, in the support of language and area studies, and it offers strong support for language training and area studies preparation, and encourages universities to invest in and maintain very expensive library facilities or staff resources. But it does not provide focused, sustained national programs in Soviet and East European research and manpower of the kind that are proposed to be supported by this legislation. From our point of view, title VI represents what could be termed an essential minimal level of national investment in area studies expertise that is required for the United States to develop and manage policy in geographic regions that are important for national security and national interest. But this is a minimal level of expertise that is

maintained through the catalyst of title VI, and it does not begin to address the requirements of policy analysis and formulation that are needed for the United States to respond to Soviet challenges.

Let me turn just for a minute to the management aspects of this proposed legislation. The structure of management that is outlined in the legislation and that comes to us through the legislative history of this bill and its various amendments has several significant virtues. It is simple, it is effective, it is responsible, and it is inexpensive. The Oversight Committee with its three members representing legislative and executive branches of government and the university community assures that the endowment will carry out its functions with a clear sense of direction and that the essential accountability of the endowment's programs can be maintained. But at the same time, the effectiveness of this design would be guaranteed by delegating the implementation of the programs of research, training, and exchange to the three major national organizations that have demonstrated strong experience and established competence in the management of complex programs of this kind; the National Council for Soviet and East European Research, the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, and the International Research and Exchanges Board have all achieved an enviable reputation for the efficiency and efficacy of their procedures for the promotion and development of research and training, and they should be charged with the administration of these programs.

Now, the essence of the procedures used by these organizations is twofold and very important. First, all proposals for support must receive careful, impartial, and informed peer review to assure that what is supported is good. Second, as little money as possible should be spent on the mechanisms of administration and the most possible on the achievement of results. By providing support only to institutions of higher education or research, not directly to individuals, this legislation rather neatly shifts the principal burden of accountability and management to those institutions, thus, preventing the duplication of bureaucracy.

This endowment income, administered by national organizations with excellent relations with both academic community and the Federal Government will be able to achieve the objectives of this legislation efficiently and responsibly. The Oversight Committee guarantees the accountability of these activities supported by the endowment to the objectives of the legislation. The arrangement is neat, effective, and efficient.

At Indiana, we have worked with all three of these national organizations. Their peer review procedures, careful evaluation of proposals and effective management have a long and successful history. With their management, the funds from this endowment can be put immediately to the task of preparing a new generation of Soviet and East European experts and expanding the research base so vital to the maintenance of our national capabilities for policy analysis and strategy formulation. The endowment, because of its stable and long-term character, working through these institutions, can begin what will be a small but steady stream of highly qualified experts and major research products in support of an essential national interest.

Thanks for listening, and I will be glad to answer your questions.
Senator QUAYLE. Thank you very much, Dr. Lombardi.
[The prepared statement of Dr. Lombardi follows:]

TESTIMONY ON

S.873

SOVIET-EASTERN EUROPEAN RESEARCH AND TRAINING ACT OF 1983

before the

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS AND HUMANITIES

OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

by

JOHN V. LOMBARDI

DEAN OF INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA

July 27, 1983

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I am pleased to testify on S.873 on behalf of the Association of American Universities, whose members include 50 major universities which share a commitment to research and graduate education as central elements of a university's purpose. Robert Rosenzweig, President of AAU, had expected to testify before this Committee but is out of the country; I have appended his written testimony to my statement. I come before you to speak about the proposed legislation in support of Soviet and East European research and training not as a specialist in Soviet affairs, but as a university administrator with considerable experience in the management of international studies. Senate bill S.873 addresses in a creative and responsible fashion a significant weakness in our country's capacity to develop, maintain, and improve our ability to analyze and understand the people, economy, government, and society of the Soviet Union and its allies in Eastern Europe. Let me take this opportunity to address briefly three items related to this legislation: the need, the design, and the management.

The Need

Any thorough review of our nation's capabilities in Soviet and East European analysis shows that the United States has experienced a serious decline in the number of highly qualified experts available in this area. The Committee has no doubt received a

significant volume of information on this topic, and my own review of the literature has convinced me that the United States will not be able to respond effectively to Soviet challenges in the next decades without taking prompt action to remedy the weakness in our research and training programs. These challenges, because they will often come in the form of economic, political, or social action rather than military action, require a very substantial pool of experts whose continuing research and study provide the foundation for appropriate strategies and policies for the United States.

Materials you have already received clearly document the decline of support for international studies in general and for Soviet bloc studies in particular, and I need not belabor that point here. But, if we have this demonstrated problem, will the proposed legislation contribute to its solution?

The Design

Research and training for Soviet and East European expertise is a long-term proposition. It takes about ten years to create a scholar who has not only the technical and language skills required but also the analytical experience necessary to make a major contribution to the nation's needs in this area. Moreover, the research that makes possible informed, accurate, and

successful international decisions by those involved in implementing national policy towards the Soviet Union and its allies requires a constant and substantial effort over an extended period. Thus, any design to promote and develop that research capability must have as its goal stable, focused support for at least a decade.

The current bill, S.873, addresses this requirement in an imaginative way through the use of an endowment. While the income of an endowment is obviously subject to the vagaries of interest rates and other economic factors, it does provide a firm base of financial support that allows the initiation and completion of long-term projects such as the training of highly qualified professionals in Soviet and East European studies.

The language proficiency required of a Soviet specialist, for example, demands both academic preparation in the classroom and overseas experience. The knowledge base required for sophisticated and profound economic or social analysis of Eastern European societies, for another example, demands long periods of study. The endowment mechanism assures considerable stability of funding and, thus, the ability to implement multi-year training and research programs.

This program is not, of course, the only effort of the federal government in the area of international studies focused on the Soviet bloc. The Departments of Education, State, and Defense, and the U.S. Information Agency, for example, all have activities that contribute to the country's ability to formulate appropriate Soviet policies. But the programs of State, Defense, and U.S.I.A. focus on immediate concerns of the agencies involved, tend to be short-term in nature, and are not designed to produce and maintain expertise but to use the expertise that is available. Thus, these agencies are consumers of the skills that will be developed under S.873.

The Department of Education, under Title VI of the Higher Education Act, sponsors a very important program in support of language and area studies. Title VI has been the cornerstone of university programs for international studies for many years, and the effectiveness of this program is recognized and supported widely within the universities, the government, and--fortunately--the Congress. But Title VI does not directly address the research component included in this proposed legislation, nor are its training programs related to Soviet studies sufficient to meet the national needs in this area. Title VI offers strong support for language training and area studies

preparation, it encourages the universities to invest in and maintain very expensive library facilities and staff resources, but it does not provide the focused, sustained national program in Soviet and East European research and manpower proposed in this legislation.

Clearly, Title VI represents an essential minimal level of national investment in area studies expertise required for the United States to develop and manage policy in geographic regions important for national security. But this minimal level of expertise maintained with the catalyst of Title VI does not begin to address the requirements of policy analysis and formulation needed for the United States to respond to Soviet challenges.

The Management

The management structure outlined in the legislation itself and described in the legislative history of this bill has several significant virtues. It is simple, effective, responsible, and inexpensive. The Oversight Committee with its three members representing legislative and executive branches of government and the university community assures that the endowment will carry out its functions with a clear sense of direction and that the essential accountability of the endowment's programs will be maintained.

At the same time, the effectiveness of this design would be guaranteed by delegating the implementation of the programs of research, training and exchange to the three major national organizations with strong experience and established competence in the management of complex programs of this kind; the National Council for Soviet and East European Research, the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, and the International Research and Exchanges Board have achieved an enviable reputation for the efficiency and efficacy of their procedures for the promotion and development of research and training and should be charged with the administration of the programs supported by this legislation.

The essence of the procedures used by these organizations is twofold. First, all proposals for support must receive careful, impartial, and informed peer review to assure that what is supported is good. Second, as little money as possible is spent on the mechanisms of administration and the most possible on the achievement of results. By providing support only to institutions of higher education or research, not directly to individuals, this legislation rather neatly shifts the principal burden of accountability and management to these institutions, thus, preventing the duplication of bureaucracy.

The endowment income, administered by national organizations with excellent relations with both the academic community and the federal government, will be able to achieve the objectives of this legislation efficiently and responsibly. The Oversight Committee guarantees the accountability of the activities supported by the endowment to the objectives of the legislation. The arrangement is neat, effective, and efficient.

At Indiana University, we have worked with all three of these national organizations. Their peer review procedures, careful evaluation of proposals, and effective management have a long and successful history. With their management, the funds from this endowment can be put immediately to the task of preparing a new generation of Soviet and East European experts and expanding the research base so vital to the maintenance of our national capabilities for policy analysis and strategy formulation. The endowment, because of its stable and long-term character, working through these institutions, can begin what will be a small but steady stream of highly qualified experts and major research products in support of an essential national interest.

Many thanks for hearing my comments. I would be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I am Robert Rosenzweig, President of the Association of American Universities, and I appear before you on behalf of universities that are members of that organization. The Association of American Universities comprises 50 American and two Canadian universities with pre-eminent programs of graduate and professional education and scholarly research. Half of the members of AAU are public institutions, half are private. Member universities are represented in the AAU by the presidents and chancellors of those universities.

I appreciate this opportunity to present our views on H.R. 601. This legislation would provide stable, increased support for academic programs of research and advanced education in Soviet and Eastern European Studies and would thereby help reverse our severely declining capacity in this critical field.

It is now widely recognized--indeed, it provides the impetus for this legislation--that there is a rapidly growing "knowledge gap" between the United States and the Soviet Union; while support for research and training in Soviet and Eastern European Studies has been steadily declining in this country, the Soviet Union continues to expand its base of expertise in American Studies through the establishment of a national network of research institutes. However, our concern is not so much with the extent of the Soviet commitment, since there is nothing we can do

to contain that in any case, but with the erosion of our own capacity to keep abreast of developments in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

A major problem for Soviet and Eastern European Studies has been the inadequate and unpredictable sources of funding. Combining the results of two recent surveys, one conducted by Stanford University for the period from 1965 to 1975 and one by the Rockefeller Foundation for 1975 to 1982, reveals that funding for research and advanced training in Soviet and Eastern European Studies dropped by 77%, in constant--uninflated--dollars, over the period from 1965 to 1982!

Exacerbating this decline in funding is unpredictability of funding from year to year. Such uncertainty can disrupt research, and it discourages students from entering a field where that uncertainty clashes with the need to make a commitment of up to seven years and more of advanced training to complete one's doctoral education.

The implications for future personnel needs are serious. There is already a substantial shortage of personnel. The National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies has estimated a need for 1,660 primary personnel (full-time

equivalents) to meet the national need for government, academic, and private sector personnel, yet only 1,074 primary personnel are now active in the field.

A recent GAO report indicates that government agencies anticipate increasing difficulty in the 1980s in acquiring needed research on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Soviet and Eastern European Studies is more mature than other area studies fields, and it is estimated that half of the recognized academic experts in the field will be dead or retired in just the next decade. Current rates of replacement fall far short of offsetting these losses, let alone reversing existing shortages. Talented, experienced scholars are shifting to other, more reliably supported fields of inquiry; and fewer of the nation's most talented students are choosing to enter the field of Soviet studies.

While the U.S. capacity to conduct critical research on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe has steadily declined, the Soviet Union has dramatically increased its capacity for research on the United States and its allies. Over the last 25 years, the Soviet Academy of Sciences has established a network of institutes to conduct comprehensive data collection and analysis in support of policy development in international relations. There are now

over 7,400 specialists working in 12 Moscow institutes alone. In 1967, the Soviet Academy of Sciences established the Institute for the Study of the USA, adding Canada to its purview in 1974. In 1977, Moscow State University created a Laboratory of American Studies, and now dozens of Soviet universities support research in "Americanistics." In addition, the Soviet Academy's Institute of the World Economy and International Relations devotes a substantial share of its research effort to the United States.

It is essential and urgent that actions are taken to redress the growing disparity between the U.S. and the Soviet Union in their respective capacities to conduct research and advanced training in international and foreign area studies. As a recent study of the role of the Soviet institutes in the formulation of foreign policy has noted:

> With the advent of nuclear parity, the influence of economic, political, scientific, technological, and ideological factors is enhanced . . . the strategies employing these non-military factors can be devised and implemented by the Soviets in the competition between the two world systems of capitalism and socialism. Under such conditions, the . . . Soviet system of information collection, processing, and forecasting which gives rise to their perceptions, is as important in systems competition as missiles would be in a contest of arms.*

* Arthur A. Zuehlke, et al., The Role of Social Science Institutes in the Formulation and Execution of Soviet Foreign Policy, Stanford Research Institute, 1976.

Clearly, our capacity to conduct high-quality research and advanced training in Soviet and Eastern European Studies directly affects our national security interests.

I would like to turn now to the role of our nation's universities in meeting that research and training capacity, and to what those institutions require to fulfill that role.

I believe that I can accurately assert--I trust without undue hubris--that American universities serve as exemplary models for other nations in the breadth and quality of their programs of research and education. Our universities function as integrated and mutually reinforcing blends of undergraduate, graduate, and professional teaching and scholarly research. In particular, the interdependence of research and advanced education in these institutions accounts in large measure for the uniquely American vitality and creativity of each. There is no better way for a bright young graduate student to learn the methods by which the frontiers of knowledge are expanded than by directly participating in the research conducted by faculty mentors working at the forefront of that student's chosen field. And one would be hard-pressed to find a faculty investigator who has not benefitted from the challenging questions and creative new insights of talented and energetic students.

This mutually beneficial interaction between teaching and research is no less important in international and foreign area studies than in the sciences. Since the close of World War II, a large and diverse system of international studies programs has grown up on university campuses. The first significant support for international studies came from organized philanthropy. The programs that it helped build served as examples and points of departure for its successors. Most notable of those successors was the Ford Foundation, which, from 1951 to 1975, spent $340 million in the development of university-based programs of international and foreign area studies. The Ford Foundation effort exceeded even that of the federal government, which invested $229 million in support of international studies through the National Defense Education Act from 1958 to 1978.

The principal stimulus for such investments was the realization that the world had become both more important for and more threatening to our nation and that, as a nation, we were ill prepared to deal effectively with it. We lacked adequate training in most of the world's languages, had few specialists in world areas of critical importance to us, and had only a limited capacity to train more. It was clearly important to develop vigorous research and training programs in international and

foreign area studies in order to produce the people and the knowledge necessary for a sound American foreign policy and hence an enhanced American security.

The success of that initial building effort was indeed impressive. But the support that created the enterprise was not sustained. When the Ford Foundation ended its program in 1975, it did so with the reasonable expectation that the federal government would provide the support needed to sustain the programs that had been built in the previous decades. Quite to the contrary, government funding declined by 58% from 1969 to 1978, falling from $20.5 million to $8.5 million in constant dollars.

The plight that has beset the field of international studies generally has struck Soviet and Eastern European Studies especially harshly. Measured in terms of practicing teachers and researchers, the capacity in this field is still strong; the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, the primary professional association for specialists in Soviet and Eastern European Studies, currently comprises 2,500 individual and nearly 100 institutional members spread throughout the United States. But as I indicated above, a substantial portion of the

practicing scholars in this field will be drawing to the end of their careers in the next decade, and they are not being replaced in equal measure.

What is needed is a federal program that provides a modest source of stable, long-term funds awarded in open competition to the best programs of research and advanced education. This legislation offers just such a program. If enacted, the Soviet-Eastern European Research and Training Act would signal to potential future teachers and scholars that the federal government recognizes the need for a continuing production of new knowledge in this field and the need for a continuing infusion of faculty into the university system that produces much of that knowledge and that trains virtually all of those who will become the succeeding generation of teachers and scholars that maintains this essential national capacity.

There are two aspects of this legislation that are particularly compatible with the ways that universities function best and that are therefore especially important to achieving the goals of the proposed program. Those provisions are: 1) stable, long-term funding, and 2) the allocation of those funds based on the relative merit of competing programs.

Both university research and university programs of graduate and postdoctoral education are long-term activities that require concomitant stable support. Research projects are complex efforts, typically requiring the integration of the activities of a number of individuals, the support of complex equipment, access to libraries for essential books and periodicals, and--particularly in international studies--travel to foreign countries. Lack of stable, extended funding can preclude promising projects being undertaken and can seriously disrupt those underway.

For students whose talents provide them with a variety of career options--precisely the caliber of student so important to recruit into the field of Soviet studies--the uncertainty of long-term support is a disincentive this nation should not permit to exist.

The provision of an endowment to provide a stable, long-term funding is a key element of the legislation that establishes a reliable minimum level of predictable support for the national research and training effort.

The second critical provision of the legislation is the allocation of project funds in open national competition on the basis of the merit of proposals as judged by panels of acknowl-

edged scholars in the field. In contrast to the practice in many other countries, where academic research funds are allocated noncompetitively--for example, as a proportion of the number of students--the "peer review" mechanism for allocating both research and training funds in this country has been singularly responsible for the often fiercely competitive, and highly successful, system of support for academic research and advanced education. Through the use of the peer review mechanism, the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, and the other mission agencies have built impressive records of support that have fostered the characteristic vitality and creativity of American science. This bill would promote the use of that same mechanism to sustain and expand the field of Soviet and Eastern European Studies.

The provision of a modest source of stable funding, allocated on the basis of merit, will benefit the field of Soviet and Eastern European Studies far in excess of the dollars expended. It will not solve all of the problems confronting the field, nor should the federal government assume that responsibility. What this legislation will do is provide continuity of support for core programs of the highest quality research and advanced education, and that argues well for the future of the discipline.

I would like to close with a final observation on the government-university relationship encouraged by this legislation. The bill specifies that the academic community develop a national agenda of research and training in consultation with representatives of interested government agencies. Such cooperation is appropriate and should be encouraged. All too often, the relationship between the federal government and the university community has been one of mutual distrust. The differing, although overlapping, interests and responsibilities of the two sectors will always sustain a healthy separation between the two but need not preclude effective communication that generates mutually beneficial programs and policies.

For its part, the university community must understand that federal support for university research and training is properly guided by the government's perception of the national interest. Government officials need to adopt a long-range and more expansive view of the nature and benefit of scholarship. Stimulating research on the cultural renaissance among the Turkic peoples of Central Asia may not provide answers to dilemmas of our relationship with the Soviet Union any more than research in high energy physics can be expected to solve our energy problems. Yet both are entitled to a similar act of faith, namely, that knowledge is to be preferred to ignorance because it may reveal possibilities that ignorance keeps hidden. Policies based on that premise would, over time, produce mutual respect between the federal government and universities in the critical area of Soviet and Eastern European Studies, and in foreign affairs generally, and would redound to the benefit of both.

Thank you for this opportunity to appear before you. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Senator QUAYLE. Dr. Pap?

Dr. PAP. Mr. Chairman, I am Michael Pap, representing the Institute for Soviet and East European Studies at John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio, the friendly neighboring State to Indiana, and I do not represent the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, as it was stated in the document.

Senator QUAYLE. The record will so reflect that.

Dr. PAP. I was born in Carpatho, Ukraine, which was a part of democratic Czechoslovakia between the two world wars. I received my graduate training at Heidelberg University in Germany after the war, and from 1950 to 1958, I was on the faculty of Notre Dame University at South Bend, Ind., and since 1958, I have been professor of Soviet and East European history and director of the Institute for Soviet and East European Studies at JCU.

I wish to thank you for the opportunity to testify on the Senate bill, 873, concerning Soviet studies and research. Clearly, the idea of a fund to support research and training in Soviet and East European studies is a significant step to sustain in a stable way and to improve such activities.

I would like very briefly to point out what can be done for very little money. I will just give you a very, very short report on the institute activities from 1961 until 1983.

The Institute for Soviet and East European Studies, John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio, was established in 1961. For the past 22 years, it has offered comprehensive educational and informational programs on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. The special training program for high school teachers and graduate students in the area of American-Soviet relations was given priority consideration. We firmly believe that the future of America depends on knowledge and better understanding of American-Soviet relations by young Americans, the future leaders of our Nation. So far, 895 high school teachers have participated in this program, disseminating the accumulated knowledge and information in our schools, reaching approximately 450,000 secondary school students.

In addition, as a public service, the institute sponsored 20 annual conferences and over 100 special public forums, reaching an audience of over 20,000 citizens of the northern Ohio region. At the conferences and forums, the most critical issues of our times, including American-Soviet relations, Sino-Soviet relations, Soviet-Russian violations of human rights, the plight of captive nations, Soviet aggressions in Africa, Southeast Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East are evaluated. Of special interest to our business community were our monthly forums on the U.S.-U.S.S.R. trade relations, which we offered during 1975-76 and 1976-77 academic years. In the past 22 years, there were 180 distinguished guest speakers from academic, government, industrial, and labor sectors participated in discussing various aspects of the Communist challenge to the United States. In the past, the institute activities were supported by various foundations, private foundations, organizations, and individuals. Unfortunately, this support was terminated at the end of the 1982-83 academic year. We are pleased to learn that the need for study of the Soviet Union is gaining recognition by our national leaders, who are charged with the responsibility for formulating policies toward the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Senate bill

873 is very much needed to support these studies of the Soviet Union.

I also want to make some comments about control of the funds. Control goes beyond the mere management of the funds. The House bill, House Resolution 601, selects the National Council for Soviet and East European Research as a major vehicle for the coordination of activities and the distribution of funds. The Senate bill gives more of the responsibility to the Oversight Committee, recommending that the national council, the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, and the International Research and Exchanges Board "each prepare and submit an application to the Oversight Committee once each fiscal year" while leaving it open for "any other organization" to submit applications.

The Senate bill, S. 873, describes the Oversight Committee as consisting of the Secretaries of State, of Defense, the Secretary of Education, the Librarian of Congress, the chairman of the American Council of Learned Societies, and the chairman of the Social Science Research Council.

The House bill does not provide an oversight function, but places the power and responsibility in the board of trustees of the national council. The board of the council originally consisted of 12 members appointed by the chancellor of the University of California, and included the presidents of the following universities: Berkeley, Calif.; Columbia; Duke; Harvard; Illinois; Indiana; Michigan; Pennsylvania; Stanford; the Provost of the University of Chicago, plus the chairman of the Academic Council of the Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies of the Wilson Center, and the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies. This original group of institutions retains the right to designate trustees, and the trustees may elect up to 6 additional members of the board to a total of 18.

It is my contention that the Senate bill, giving major responsibility to an oversight committee, is a more suitable and open arrangement than the one suggested by House Resolution 601.

The national council itself is a peculiar entity, as explained in testimony before the House Subcommittee on Post-Secondary Education. It, by its own mandate, has a narrow scope and objective, requiring specialists in particular fields, very much in line with carrying out its functions. But it is weighted also in a particular direction which may be conducive to depth rather than breadth.

Furthermore, I would suggest that two additional members be added to the proposed Oversight Committee in the Senate bill: the chairmen of the House and Senate Foreign Relations Committees. This point needs to be made with respect to a remark made by the executive director of the national council. He said:

There comes a point, however, where too much "oversight" power in the hands of Executive Branch employees could also threaten the purpose of the Act to sustain advanced research and training in the nation's academic community.

Further, the Senate's proposal that each of the entities involved "prepare and submit an application" to the Oversight Committee would appear to reduce potential conflicts of interest, whether of individuals, of institutions, or consortia.

Both the House and Senate bills appear to limit solicitation of proposals for research contracts to American institutions of higher

education and not-for-profit corporations, "which contracts shall contain shared-cost provisions." In addition, however, the Senate bill states that "Payments may be made to any other organization not referred to in this section to carry out research and training in Soviet and Eastern European Studies." It is not clear whether these other organizations can be for-profit institutions, but it is better to include this statement in order not to exclude other resources.

A question arises regarding the reliance on contracts alone. But that is not at all clear, either. "One part of the payments" is distributed in various ways to the national council or board or center, but are each of these contractual relations or grants? We would support inclusion of a grant mechanism into the applications process through the council, the center and the board to the Oversight Committee.

Further, while the idea of shared-costs is sound, it is possible that it is exclusionary, at least to the extent that some universities or colleges may not have the financial basis upon which to meet cost-sharing commitments. Perhaps a waiver should be included, permitting those with least resources to be included in the application process.

Objectives of the fund. As noted earlier, the objectives of the fund are generally limited to advanced research and training, which rightfully include those individuals and institutions of a quality to sustain those objectives. But, the fund should not exclude other objectives and other institutions that may be useful and needed in the various areas of endeavor proposed in both bills. There are certainly many institutions apart from those mentioned by the National Council having programs related to the Soviet and Eastern European affairs, such as area studies, diplomatic studies, teacher training for secondary schools, et cetera, as exemplified by our own institute. These may serve as the resources from which are drawn the fellows, the researchers, the exchangees. While the primary focus of the fund should remain advanced studies and research—these other opportunities and resources should not be overlooked. The proposed legislation in S. 873 does give one the impression that a more competitive arena of national resources is being excluded from its range of interests, but less so than the House bill. (Unfortunately, I have just learned about the proposed modifications to S. 873 by the Foreign Relations Committee regarding the Oversight Committee. It seems to me that, to eliminate all chance and rumor of conflicts of interest, it would be more appropriate to return to the original version in S. 873—as noted earlier in my comments—and to add the two chairpersons also mentioned.)

Senator QUAYLE. Dr. Pap, let me interrupt you. I have another vote.

Dr. PAP. I have finished.

Senator QUAYLE. Oh, you have finished, OK. I was going to say that we will put the entire statement in the record.

[The following was received for the record:]

JC john carroll university
UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS, CLEVELAND, OHIO 44118
AREA CODE 216 - 491-4320

INSTITUTE FOR SOVIET AND
EAST EUROPEAN STUDIES

COMMENTS FROM PARTICIPANTS
IN THE 1982 SUMMER
IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM

"The program is very informative and varied enough to hold your interest. The speakers were all very good and gave us a unique opportunity to hear and question experts in affairs that are current and important. Also, the professors are very helpful and friendly and open to the participants. This program has made me aware of the fact that it is necessary to stress more to my students the problems and past history of East and Central Europe and the Soviet Union. The annual conference made the program open to the general public and gave it a community-wide scope."

- Pat Ambrose
West Geauga School District
Geauga, Ohio

"The Institute is led by one of the foremost experts in the U.S. I will be using some of the books in class. We have a course called Comparative Government in which we compare communism and democracy. The annual conference was excellent. It helps one see the total depth of a problem."

- Charles Caputo
Berkshire High School
Burton, Ohio

"I received so many different views and had excellent discussions in the class. Simply an invaluable experience. Keep doing the excellent, informative job for years to come."

- Peter Cimoroni
Beachwood, Ohio

"The program is well organized. All of the guest lecturers were experts in their field and did add very much to expanding our insight in this area. The annual conference was for me an overview of the whole program. The speakers presented clearly the present reality of world affairs and the American role in them. The program is an excellent way of showing to many people what communism is all about. It should be continued and promoted."

- Anthony Cuvalo
North Randall, Ohio

"I was able to gain more knowledge about a variety of topics because of my own research work and listening to the presentations of the other participants in the workshops. The guest lecturers enriched the program by sharing with us their own expertise and the annual conference reinforced the topics of both the guest lecturers and the research papers. I teach World Culture classes and the History of the Soviet Union. I now have a better understanding of recent events and will be able to share this knowledge with my students in the classroom."

- Kathryn A. Dilger
St. Augustine's Academy
Cleveland, Ohio

"The program provided a great opportunity for concentrated research and study. Having an opportunity to concentrate solely on one topic and receiving the benefit of others work was very rewarding. I teach both government and geography. The interaction of people and events about which we studied will be of tremendous value in providing a more extensive background for the students. The guest lecturers provided a good historical connecting link. The insights were important for expanding both knowledge and point of view."

- Brother William Fealy
Central Catholic High School
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

"I shall transmit to my students the urgency of understanding and becoming aware of the privileges that we have as American citizens in a free democratic society as opposed to those who endure restraints and are not allowed to reap the full values of life. Undoubtedly, the annual conference is an instrumental means of sharing information with a more general public. It is definitely a public service which should be continued."

- Maryrose Galati
Holy Name High School
Cleveland, Ohio

"This is an exceptionally good program. It is well organized and the quality of instruction is the best. I teach students in Advanced Political Science and we make sure to attend every public forum the Institute has during the school year. This Institute is very well known and respected. I take this information back to my classrooms and share it with hundreds of students on a weekly basis. Such programs provide the in-depth knowledge that in many cases cannot be found in a textbook. I have purchased during the year many of the books discussed in class and I have followed up with additional readings and research on the various topics that we have discussed in class. The Institute provides us with a wealth of interesting and applicable knowledge. I have no trouble adapting the ideas from the Institute to my classroom."

- J. Scott Herdman
Highland Local Schools
Medina County Joint Vocational School
Medina, Ohio

"The Institute's summer program on Democracy versus Communism is excellent. I will be able to use the knowledge received in my classroom next school year. Foreign policy issues are continually in flux and these updates which the Institute provides gives me the ability to stay current and subsequently offer better lessons for the next year. Furthermore, the exchange of ideas by illuminating the various aspects of the issues discussed encourages class discussions."

- James Kelley
Euclid High School
Euclid, Ohio

"I strongly feel that the Institute is necessary. It should be expanded. I teach American History. When I get to the U. S. Constitution, I am going to do a comparison between the U. S. and U.S.S.R. Constitutions so that the students will gain a realization of what the Communist system is really like. The Institute is fulfilling a necessary function!! Many more years of continued service."

- Joseph Kostrab
West Geauga High School
Chesterland, Ohio

"The program is well organized and very well geared to helping the classroom teacher adopt strategies for handling the teaching of the Soviet Union. The guest lecturers brought detailed knowledge to specific issues. I enjoyed the program and learned much from it. I liked the balance it provides to some of the prevailing scholarship."

- Richard Mack
Strongsville City School
Strongsville, Ohio

"Basically this program has made me aware of problems currently existing in the Soviet Union. The association with other teachers in the Institute and discussing classroom techniques of implementation of new material was indeed informative. Also, the major benefit of discussions has given me new insight into world problems. I will attempt to create new interest in the area of Comparative Government for my classroom. I was somewhat amazed at the number of people in attendance at the annual conference. It represents the determination of people in this area and also of the Institute who have taken the time and energy to bring about the awareness of problems."

- Ronald Macks
West Geauga High School
Eastlake, Ohio

"I have benefited by the knowledge gained from others as well as by doing the research. My classes will be enriched by my extended knowledge in this area. I will use much of the information, as it is current and up-to-date. The materials that I received will also help me to aid my students to a better understanding of world affairs and their place in it."

- Fred G. McVey
Euclid High School
Euclid, Ohio

"The Institute is valuable to teachers and others who are in the role of teaching the two concepts--democracy and communism. I will use the knowledge gained to conduct current events discussions on world events. The bibliographies from other students will be compiled and will serve as a great source to which to refer students. I will be able to convey to students the importance which U. S. foreign policy has not only for the U. S. but realistically for other countries, which is sometimes overlooked. The guest lecturers provided their expertise and gave us insights and information that we couldn't really discern from just doing research on one or two main topics. The whole idea of educated citizenry taking their role in perpetuating Democracy and understanding the dangers of Communism is just so vital to our way of life!"

- Christine L. Mock
Westlake School District
Westlake, Ohio

"The overall program was well organized and emphasized and concentrated on all the important aspects of each system--democracy and communism. The readings and books were well chosen and were very useful."

- Hedieh Nasheri
Cleveland Heights, Ohio

"The Institute summer program is excellent. The classes were informative and stimulating. I found the class outlines and bibliographies given out by fellow students of great use in my classes, as well as the notes from class lectures. I was able last year and hope this year to use all of the information gathered here for three of my history classes. This information has been shared with other members of our teaching staff."

- Paul Ostrowski
Portsmouth High School
Portsmouth, New Hampshire

"The accumulated knowledge gained from participation in the program will be a great help in my World Issues course, World Civilizations course, and American Foreign Policy course. The guest lecturers' topics were timely, well addressed, and gave the opportunity to ask questions. The annual conference provided a good opportunity to hear different aspects of one topic. The number of people who came to the conference says something about the need and appreciation of it."

- Sister Emilie Palladino, S.N.D.
Notre Dame Academy
Los Angeles, California

"I found this Institute to be outstanding. The high quality of instruction, coupled with the varied contributions of the participants makes this program invaluable. I teach American History as well as a Current U. S. History Course. The information I have received in lectures become the basis for my own class lectures. The bibliographies and outlines produced on each topic are invaluable tools. I frequently use the bibliographies for my own information and reading as well as recommending readings to my students. The large public response to the annual conference reinforces the urgency of this Institute. It is proof that the discussions and lectures are not merely academic exercises but highly relevant and personal in their meaning to the public. Thank you for this great opportunity to share in this program."

- Virginia Russ
Trinity High School
Garfield Heights, Ohio

"I believe that the Institute gives a very objective and realistic approach on Democracy versus Communism. What I particularly like is the many fallacies that Dr. Pap and Dr. Prpic bring out about Communism and the Middle East. I feel I also learned from my fellow students through discussions."

- Joseph Sanda
Warrensville Board of Education
Warrensville, Ohio

"The Institute's program is excellent, enlightening, informative, provocative and very educational. It helps to provide not only an understanding of the forces of Democracy and Communism in the world but provides everyone involved the opportunity to describe, explain, identify, and discuss these movements. The guest lecturers were excellent, well chosen, informative and very current. The annual conference emphasized the importance of knowledge of Soviet affairs, the threats of communism, and how to keep ourselves and others informed regarding the grave concerns which communism poses in the world."

- John F. Semenik
Medina Senior High
Medina, Ohio

"The Soviet Institute provides the student with an excellent variety of interrelated avenues of approach to the political, social and economic situations in the eastern and western bloc countries. The guest lecturers provided expert analyses of complex international situations in a streamlined fashion which, yet, addressed themselves to the essentials of the discussions. I refer specifically to the talks given on Afghanistan and Indochina. The annual conference provided the perfect format for generating discussions and provoking thoughts on myriad problems. I want to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the Institute for allowing me to participate in the seminar by virtue of its scholarship program."

- Norman D. Solomon
Cleveland, Ohio

"The Institute program is excellent, thought-provoking. I highly recommend the entire program. The time was well worth the tremendous effort put in by students and professors alike. It has been an unending learning experience and one I hope to be able to repeat in the years to come. Much of the knowledge gained can be used to begin a discussion, i. e. current events involving the Middle East, with background materials so the students can understand the reasoning behind some problem. Last school year the discussions based on my experience from the Soviet Institute made the students think and verbalize their thoughts. These were some of the best days in the classroom as everyone became involved. They listened and questioned. The guest lecturers brought in their expertise on areas which we could not otherwise have covered as fully. The annual conference is extremely important as it involves the general public so the information can filter out even further. I am very grateful for the fellowship and for the opportunity to participate in this program."

- Robin B. Speer
Ehove Joint Vocational School
Milan, Ohio

"It is an excellent program. I have acquired excellent bibliographies on all the topics covered by all the students in the course which I can use for references for student reports in my classroom and for additional information in preparing my classroom presentations. The guest lecturers represented personal expertise to compliment the written materials that were utilized in preparation of our reports. Their observations were very enlightening and thought provoking. Excellent speakers with excellent credentials. It was rewarding to see so many local people attend the annual conference. It shows that the American people are interested in the topics presented."

- John Tarnosky, Jr.
Berea High School
Berea, Ohio

"Much information is needed by today's students to know and understand today's world. Educators must gather such information in order to pass it on to students. The Institute is a valuable tool in this information process. This coming year we will be studying the Soviet Union in our geography unit as our study of a European nation. All of the information will be most useful in class."

- Robert Vesely
Beachwood School District
Beachwood, Ohio

"The Institute's summer program is excellent. I found the professors to be knowledgeable. I have gained some insights that I did not have before. I have put together a Soviet program in my school and the information I have received will be used with my students. The guest lecturers contributed their own expertise. The topics they discussed were important in light of today's events and well organized."

- Suzanne A. Vlahach
Academy of the Resurrection
Rye, New York

"The program furthered my understanding of the soviet system and its global impact. I also received some insight into the U. S. role in world affairs. The guest lecturers were outstanding. They brought expertise to specific topics. The presentations by class members and their varied viewpoints enhanced the program. Everyone in class was very interesting and seemed to be well versed on their topics."

- Jack Wagar
Mentor Public Schools
Mentor, Ohio

"The Institute program gave a great deal of information in an area which needs to become more a part of our general education. This program was especially important to me because I will be developing a new course on Soviet Culture in the fall. It gave me many ideas and many interesting points of view from which to approach the topic."

- James F. Wallenhorst
St. Edward High School
Lakewood, Ohio

"I found the program to be an exceptionally interesting and provocative experience. It clarified and expanded upon prior knowledge of the conflict between Democracy and Communism. Finally, it provided me with excellent source materials to employ in my classroom teaching."

- Leonard Weisenberg
Euclid High School
Euclid, Ohio

Senator QUAYLE. I have about 3 minutes before I am going to have to vote again. I have one question that I would like each of the panel members to comment on, and that is the choice between an endowment funding or use of specifically title VI within the Higher Education Act. Any preference on this?

Dr. CLODIUS. For me, there is no question, Senator Quayle. I would prefer this as an endowment, to be added on top of the appropriations for title VI. Title VI does not go far enough, really, in terms of addressing itself to research and scholarship. And besides that, the battle of the annual appropriation seems to me to nullify the very genius of this kind of a bill, which is to give some long-term endowment, so that plans can be made to address a long run problem. As I suggest in my testimony, it is not going to go away on an annual budget basis. Learning about the Soviet Union, research and scholarship on the Soviet Union, are going to be with us, I am sure, for the rest of the lifetimes of all of the people in this room. So endowment is the only way to get it.

Senator QUAYLE. So, if you had your choice, endowment, rather than title VI.

Dr. CLODIUS. You have said it precisely.

Senator QUAYLE. Dr. Lombardi?

Dr. LOMBARDI. Yes, I would endorse that, with one other point. That is, one of the reasons for not including it in title VI, along with those mentioned by my colleagues, is that to include it within title VI will make it extremely difficult to achieve the highly focused, resource orientation and manpower training orientation of this particular legislation, which has as one of its imaginative and innovative features, both the notion of the endowment and second, the experiment to see whether such an endowment focused on this kind of a problem can produce indeed significant results, in this

sort of tightly focused way. And if you include it within title VI, it is extremely difficult to separate out the broad range of activities title VI was designed to do, at a relatively lower level, and the tightly focused, high level activities that are the focus of this bill.

Senator QUAYLE. Dr. Pap, do you agree?

Dr. PAP. I am in agreement, yes.

Senator QUAYLE. Let me ask one other question. As far as the way that the organization of the board is set up to disburse funds, with the Secretary of State, the head of the Library of Congress, and the president of AAU—any additions or subtractions, or are you comfortable with that organization?

Dr. CLODIUS. I find that a rather attractive organization, because it does represent the executive, it does represent the legislative, and it does represent the academic community, and AAU can be a proxy for all of the universities and colleges that will be involved in this, and I think among those three groups, this ought to be an effective and efficient program.

Senator QUAYLE. Dr. Lombardi?

Dr. LOMBARDI. I agree with that, and would only add that it also has the great virtue of being simple, which in dealing with the management of this kind of program, where we expect the action to take place at a different level and we expect the Oversight Committee to set the specific objectives, the neatness of it is a real great attraction.

Senator QUAYLE. Dr. Pap?

Dr. PAP. I have no quarrel with that, except as I mentioned, I would like to see in the Oversight Committee, the representation of the House and Senate Foreign Relations Committees, to have a legislative body represented. I would recommend however the exclusion of the president of AAU.

Senator QUAYLE. OK. Thank you very much for your contribution. I am sure that we will be in contact, and good luck. Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 4:15 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]